

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

106th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 299

September 30, 1999, 10:00 a.m.  
Page S-11666 Temp. Record

## LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION/Afterschool Program Future Funding

**SUBJECT:** Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000 . . . S. 1650. Specter motion to table the Boxer amendment No. 1809.

### ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 54-45

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. 1650, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000, will provide \$324.2 billion in new budget authority, which is \$22.531 billion more than provided in fiscal year (FY) 1999 and is \$911.0 million less than requested. This amount includes advance discretionary and mandatory appropriations and \$9.902 billion in spending from trust funds. Budget authority for fiscal year 2000 discretionary spending will total \$84.018 billion.

**The Boxer amendment** would increase the appropriation for the 21st Century Schools Program by \$200 million. Instead of providing offsets, it would use advance appropriations. (The 21st Century Schools Program began as a Republican initiative in 1994. The program's purpose was to promote the broader use of school facilities, equipment, and resources, including for afterschool programs. The Clinton Administration, until 2 years ago, consistently tried to eliminate the program. Two years ago, though, it made regulatory changes to turn this multi-purpose program into a program just to fund after-school programs, and it now favors funding increases; \$200 million was provided for FY 1999; this bill proposes \$400 million for the program.)

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. After debate, Senator Specter moved to table the Boxer amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

**Those favoring** the motion to table contended:

Argument 1:

(See other side)

YEAS (54)			NAYS (45)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (53 or 98%)		Democrats (1 or 2%)	Republicans (1 or 2%)	Democrats (44 or 98%)		Republicans (1)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Helms	Feingold	Snowe	Akaka	Kennedy	McCain- <sup>2</sup>	
Allard	Hutchinson			Baucus	Kerrey		
Ashcroft	Hutchison			Bayh	Kerry		
Bennett	Inhofe			Biden	Kohl		
Bond	Jeffords			Bingaman	Landrieu		
Brownback	Kyl			Boxer	Lautenberg		
Bunning	Lott			Breaux	Leahy		
Burns	Lugar			Bryan	Levin		
Campbell	Mack			Byrd	Lieberman		
Chafee	McConnell			Cleland	Lincoln		
Cochran	Murkowski			Conrad	Mikulski		
Collins	Nickles			Daschle	Moynihan		
Coverdell	Roberts			Dodd	Murray		
Craig	Roth			Dorgan	Reed		
Crapo	Santorum			Durbin	Reid		
DeWine	Sessions			Edwards	Robb		
Domenici	Shelby			Feinstein	Rockefeller		
Enzi	Smith, Bob (I)			Graham	Sarbanes		
Fitzgerald	Smith, Gordon			Harkin	Schumer		
Frist	Specter			Hollings	Torricelli		
Gorton	Stevens			Inouye	Wellstone		
Gramm	Thomas			Johnson	Wyden		
Grams	Thompson						
Grassley	Thurmond						
Gregg	Voinovich						
Hagel	Warner						
Hatch							

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

When Democrats were last in control of Congress they only appropriated \$750,000 for afterschool programs paid for through the 21st Century Schools program. In 1997, \$1 million was appropriated; in 1998, \$40 million was appropriated; last year, \$200 million was appropriated. This year, we have budgeted for \$400 million. With all due respect, we believe that these increases have been a little more than modest. For this year, we have proposed doubling funding, which is the maximum amount that we could get within our budget for this bill. Most Republicans object to the huge increase in spending that this bill contains, and they will very likely vote against this bill if spending rises even higher. We have already pushed the spending in this bill to the limit most Republicans will accept. We recognize that our Democratic colleagues will happily vote to increase spending for any number of purposes, and after they do they will happily blame Republicans for breaking the budget. In this case, though, following that strategy will not break the budget because it will kill this bill. The reality is that this vote is purely political. We have proposed doubling funding, so Democrats have proposed tripling it. Had we proposed tripling funding, they would have asked for four or five times as much. There is no real limit; last year only 184 grants were given under this program though 2,000 requests were received; therefore, Democrats could easily have said we needed ten times as much funding. This amendment is just for show; Democrats want to prove that they are more committed to afterschool programs by voting for more funding than Republicans. It is a game of one-upmanship, and it is a game that Republicans will always lose because Democrats will always be willing to spend more of the taxpayers' money to show how concerned they are. Democrats may play their games; we of course oppose this amendment.

**Argument 2:**

We agree on the need for afterschool programs, and we believe that the Federal Government should have a role. It does, through a broad number of programs, including the 21st Century Schools Program, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act, and the Child Care Development Block Grant. We know also of 19 Federal programs that have tutoring and mentoring components, including Learn and Serve, the Juvenile Justice Mentoring Program, CAMP, AmeriCorps, VISTA, and TRIO. In the last couple of years the 21st Century Schools Program has been turned by the Clinton Administration, by regulatory action, from a multi-purpose program into a program that pays for afterschool programs, and it has requested (and received) large funding increases. We understand that it is fun for liberal Members to spend taxpayers' money like cartoon dictators tossing coins to the rabble, but we believe that a much more effective approach would be to try to spend the money a little more intelligently instead of always just looking for ways to spend more. For instance, if the existing programs were consolidated to eliminate most of the administrative costs of running multiple programs, more money would end up being available for afterschool programs. Similarly, we could get better results if we were to block grant funding and demand results (such as that a State must reach a certain percentage of children being in a supervised setting after school, whether governmental, charitable, or parental, in order to continue receiving funds). Simply saying we have succeeded because we have set up government programs elevates process over results. Lots of programs that are poorly run and poorly attended will not do any good. By championing the funding for this program, our liberal colleagues are able to take credit for coming up with the "new" idea of Federal funding for afterschool programs. We note that if they champion true reforms they will still be able to take credit, and they will also have an easier time getting them enacted, because we will be right there with them pushing for enactment. In this case, though, at the risk of denying our liberal colleagues accolades for further bloating this fast-growing program (while ignoring existing commitments, such as paying the Federal share of the costs of disabilities education), we must support the motion to table.

**Those opposing the motion to table contended:**

Our kids deserve to be in afterschool programs, but every day millions of kids go home to empty homes. They do not get help with their homework; they do not have any supervision. In boredom, they end up getting into trouble. Most teen crime and most teen pregnancies occur during the unsupervised hours that occur after school has ended and before tired parents have returned home from work in the evening. In an ideal world, kids would have a mother or father at home when they get out of school, but we all know that we do not live in an ideal world. Rather than ignoring reality, we ought to respond with help. Members who are concerned about the cost of starting afterschool programs are being penny-wise and pound-foolish. It is much less expensive to start these programs and to keep kids on the straight-and-narrow than it is to pay for the disastrous social costs that come from leaving children unsupervised. This year, President Clinton has asked that we triple funding for the program. He asked for that increase because experts at the Education Department said that is the largest increase that the program can absorb without wasting money. Our colleagues have proposed only a doubling of this program. They should not be so stingy. Passing the Boxer amendment would result in the participation of an extra 370,000 children in afterschool programs. We favor that result, and thus oppose the motion to table.